



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,256	10/25/2001	Robert Morena	SP000-253	2368

22928 7590 04/23/2003

CORNING INCORPORATED  
SP-TI-3-1  
CORNING, NY 14831

EXAMINER

GREENE, JASON M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1724

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/045,256

Applicant(s)

MORENA ET AL.

Examiner

Jason M. Greene

Art Unit

1724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1 and 2. 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claims***

1. With regard to claim 13, the Examiner suggests Applicants change the word "consists" in line 4 to the word "consisting".
2. With regard to claim 20, the Examiner suggests Applicants change the word "consists" in line 1 to the word "consisting".
3. With regard to claim 24, the Examiner suggests Applicants change the word "consists" in line 10 to the word "consisting".
4. With regard to claim 32, the Examiner suggests Applicants change the word "consists" in line 1 to the word "consisting".

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1724

6. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 30 recites the polymer being an aqueous-based cellulose ether polymer. However, claim 28, from which claim 30 depends, already recites the polymer being a crosslinked polyacrylic acid copolymer. Therefore, it is not clear whether the polymer in claim 30 is intended to be an aqueous-based cellulose ether polymer or a crosslinked polyacrylic acid copolymer. For examination purposes, claim 30 was assumed to depend from claim 24, and, therefore, the polymer was assumed to be an aqueous-based cellulose ether polymer.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morena.

With regard to claims 1-5, Morena discloses a ceramic structure comprising a first phase  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O} \cdot \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 4\text{SiO}_2$  (CAS<sub>4</sub>) and a second phase  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O} \cdot \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 2\text{SiO}_2$  (CAS<sub>2</sub>) in

Art Unit: 1724

col. 1, line 58 to col. 6, line 28. Morena explicitly discloses the ceramic structure including a  $\text{CAS}_4$  (pollucite) phase and a  $\text{CAS}_2$  phase in col. 3, lines 4-7 and col. 5, lines 2-3.

Morena et al. does not explicitly disclose the ceramic structure having high thermal expansion anisotropy of between 1400-1450 ppm, as calculated from dimensional change  $\Delta L/L_0$  over a temperature range from room temperature to 1000  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ , an average coefficient of thermal expansion from room temperature to 1000  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  of about  $-10 \times 10^{-7}/^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $+25 \times 10^{-7}/^{\circ}\text{C}$  or about  $-5 \times 10^{-7}/^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $+15 \times 10^{-7}/^{\circ}\text{C}$ , or a  $\text{CAS}_4$ - $\text{CAS}_2$  I-ratio of about 0.25 to 3.0, 0.5 to 2.0, or 1.0.

However, since the claimed ceramic structure is produced from the same material as the ceramic structure of Morena, the ceramic structure of Morena will inherently exhibit the claimed properties. More specifically, the claimed ceramic structure is disclosed as being formed by reacting a glass frit consisting of 60-68 weight percent  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O}$ , 29-35 weight percent  $\text{SiO}_2$ , and optionally 3-5 weight percent  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  with an alumina powder in page 7, line 21 to page 8, line 2. Morena discloses the ceramic structure being formed by reacting a glass frit consisting of 65-75 weight percent  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O}$ , 25-35 weight percent  $\text{SiO}_2$ , and optionally 1-5 weight percent  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  with an alumina powder in col. 3, lines 39-51. Therefore, since the ceramic structures are formed from the same starting material, the final ceramic structures will be identical and will, therefore, have the same  $\text{CAS}_4$ - $\text{CAS}_2$  I-ratios and thermal expansion coefficients and will exhibit identical thermal expansion anisotropy.

With regard to claim 6, Morena discloses the glass frit optionally including alkaline earth metal oxides, such as strontium oxide (SrO), in col. 4, lines 11-20. Since the SrO will react with the  $\text{SiO}_2$  and  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ , the ceramic structure formed from the glass frit including SrO will include a third  $\text{SrO} \cdot \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 2\text{SiO}_2$  ( $\text{SAS}_2$ ) phase.

Since the alkaline earth metals are limited to beryllium, magnesium, calcium, strontium, barium, and radium, one of ordinary skill in the art would at once envisage the alkaline earth metal oxides including strontium oxide.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morena in view of Nishimura et al.

Morena discloses a ceramic structure comprising a first phase  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O} \cdot \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 4\text{SiO}_2$  ( $\text{CAS}_4$ ) and a second phase  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O} \cdot \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 2\text{SiO}_2$  ( $\text{CAS}_2$ ) in col. 1, line 58 to col. 6, line 28. Morena explicitly discloses the ceramic structure including a  $\text{CAS}_4$  (pollucite) phase and a  $\text{CAS}_2$  phase in col. 3, lines 4-7 and col. 5, lines 2-3. Morena also discloses the glass frit optionally including alkaline earth metal oxides, such as strontium oxide (SrO), in col.

4, lines 11-20. Since the optional SrO will react with the  $\text{SiO}_2$  and  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ , the ceramic structure formed from the glass frit including SrO will include a third  $\text{SrO} \cdot \text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot 2\text{SiO}_2$  ( $\text{SAS}_2$ ) phase. Since the alkaline earth metals are limited to beryllium, magnesium, calcium, strontium, barium, and radium, one of ordinary skill in the art would at once envisage the alkaline earth metal oxides including strontium oxide.

Morena et al. does not explicitly disclose the ceramic structure having high thermal expansion anisotropy of between 1400-1450 ppm, as calculated from dimensional change  $\Delta L/L_0$  over a temperature range from room temperature to 1000  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ , an average coefficient of thermal expansion from room temperature to 1000  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  of about  $-10 \times 10^{-7}/^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $+25 \times 10^{-7}/^{\circ}\text{C}$  or about  $-5 \times 10^{-7}/^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $+15 \times 10^{-7}/^{\circ}\text{C}$ , or a  $\text{CAS}_4$ - $\text{CAS}_2$  I-ratio of about 0.25 to 3.0, 0.5 to 2.0, or 1.0.

However, since the claimed ceramic structure is produced from the same material as the ceramic structure of Morena, the ceramic structure of Morena will inherently exhibit the claimed properties. More specifically, the claimed ceramic structure is disclosed as being formed by reacting a glass frit consisting of 60-68 weight percent  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O}$ , 29-35 weight percent  $\text{SiO}_2$ , and optionally 3-5 weight percent  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  with an alumina powder in page 7, line 21 to page 8, line 2. Morena discloses the ceramic structure being formed by reacting a glass frit consisting of 65-75 weight percent  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O}$ , 25-35 weight percent  $\text{SiO}_2$ , and optionally 1-5 weight percent  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  with an alumina powder in col. 3, lines 39-51. Therefore, since the ceramic structures are formed from the same starting material, the final ceramic structures will be identical and will,

Art Unit: 1724

therefore, have the same  $CAS_4$ - $CAS_2$  I-ratios and thermal expansion coefficients and will exhibit identical thermal expansion anisotropy.

Morena et al. does not disclose the ceramic structure being a diesel particulate filter wherein the diesel particulate filter comprises a honeycomb body, the honeycomb having an inlet end and an outlet end and a multiplicity of cells extending from the inlet end to the outlet end, the cells having porous walls, wherein part of the total number of cells at the inlet end are plugged along a portion of their lengths, and the remaining part of cells that are open at the inlet end are plugged at the outlet end along a portion of the lengths, so that an engine exhaust stream passing through the cells of the honeycomb from the inlet end to the outlet end flows into the open cells, through the cell walls, and out of the structure through the open sells at the outlet end.

Nishimura discloses a similar ceramic structure formed as a diesel particulate filter wherein the diesel particulate filter comprises a honeycomb body, the honeycomb having an inlet end and an outlet end and a multiplicity of cells extending from the inlet end to the outlet end, the cells having porous walls, wherein part of the total number of cells at the inlet end are plugged along a portion of their lengths, and the remaining part of cells that are open at the inlet end are plugged at the outlet end along a portion of the lengths, so that an engine exhaust stream passing through the cells of the honeycomb from the inlet end to the outlet end flows into the open cells, through the cell walls, and out of the structure through the open sells at the outlet end in col. 4, line 27 to col. 13, line 57.



Art Unit: 1724

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the ceramic of Morena into the honeycomb structure of Nishimura to allow the diesel particulate filter to be formed from a ceramic material having a high melting point, high temperature stability, low elastic modulus, and a low coefficient of thermal expansion, as suggested by Morena in col. 1, lines 18-29.

11. Claims 13, 15, 17-19, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morena in view of Nishimura et al.

With regard to claims 13, 15, 18, 19, and 21-23, Morena discloses a method of producing a formable mixture comprising combining a dry blend material consisting essentially of 65-90 percent by weight of a glass frit and 10-35 percent by weight  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ , wherein the glass frit consists essentially of, expressed in weight percent on an oxide basis, 65-75 percent  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O}$ , 25-35 percent  $\text{SiO}_2$ , and optionally 1-5 percent  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  with an organic binder in col. 1, line 58 to col. 6, line 28.

Morena et al. does not disclose the formable mixture including a solvent selected from the group consisting of deionized water, an emulsion consisting essentially of about 95 weight percent deionized water, about 0.7 weight percent triethanolamine, and about 4.3 weight percent oleic acid, and combinations thereof, or a polymer selected from the group consisting of crosslinked polyacrylic acid copolymer, a polyethylene oxide polymer, and combinations thereof.

Nishimura et al. discloses a similar method of producing a formable mixture comprising combining a dry blend ceramic material, a solvent comprising water, and methylcellulose polymer, wherein the formable mixture is extruded into a monolithic honeycomb structure in col. 4, lines 29-62.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the water solvent and methylcellulose polymer of Nishimura et al. into the dry blend material of Morena to produce a formable mixture capable of being extruded into a honeycomb filter.

While Nishimura et al. does not explicitly disclose the water being deionized water, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the need to use deionized water to avoid introducing foreign contaminants into the formable mixture.

With regard to claim 17, Morena discloses the glass frit optionally including a low proportion of alkaline earth metal oxides, such as strontium oxide (SrO), in col. 4, lines 11-20. Since the alkaline earth metals are limited to beryllium, magnesium, calcium, strontium, barium, and radium, one of ordinary skill in the art would at once envisage the alkaline earth metal oxides including strontium oxide.

12. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morena and Nishimura et al. as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Quadir et al.

Morena and Nishimura et al. do not disclose the polymer being a crosslinked polyacrylic acid copolymer.

Quadir et al. discloses a similar formable mixture wherein the polymer is a crosslinked polyacrylic acid copolymer in col. 2, lines 21-61.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the crosslinked polyacrylic acid copolymer for the methylcellulose polymer of Morena and Nishimura et al. in that such are alternate polymers in the art for producing a formable ceramic mixture, mere substitution of one known formable mixture producing polymer for another in the art being within the scope of one having ordinary skill in the art.

13. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morena and Nishimura et al. as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Mori et al.

Morena and Nishimura et al. do not disclose up to 2 percent by weight of  $\text{Li}_2\text{O}$  being substituted for  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O}$ .

Mori et al. discloses a similar formable mixture wherein 2 mole percent (0.2 weight percent) of  $\text{Li}_2\text{O}$  is substituted for  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O}$  in col. 3, lines 33-49.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the  $\text{Li}_2\text{O}$  of Mori et al. into the formable mixture of Morena and Nishimura et al. to maintain the low thermal expansion property of the ceramic within a range from room temperature to a temperature exceeding  $1000^\circ\text{C}$ , as suggested by Mori et al. in col. 3, lines 33-39.

14. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morena and Nishimura et al. as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Bailey.

Nishimura et al. discloses the solvent being an emulsion consisting essentially of about 95 percent (93 weight percent) water and about 5 weight percent (7 weight percent) stearic acid, wherein the stearic acid serves as a lubricant in col. 10, lines 1-4.

Morena and Nishimura et al. do not disclose the solvent being an emulsion consisting essentially of about 95 weight percent deionized water, about 0.7 weight percent triethanolamine, and about 4.3 weight percent oleic acid.

Bailey discloses a ceramic mixture including an emulsion of water, triethanolamine, and oleic acid in col. 4, lines 16-19.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the triethanolamine and oleic acid lubricants of Bailey for the stearic acid lubricant of Morena and Nishimura et al. in that such are alternate lubricants in the art for producing a formable ceramic mixture, mere substitution of one known lubricant for another in the art being within the scope of one having ordinary skill in the art.

While Bailey does not disclose the specific ratio of triethanolamine to oleic acid, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that the ratio could have been varied to provide a formable mixture having desired flow properties for a particular application.

15. Claims 24, 25, 27, 29-31, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morena in view of Nishimura et al.

With regard to claims 24, 25, 30, 31, 34, and 35, Morena discloses a method of making a monolithic structure for high temperature applications comprising forming a mixture comprising 95 percent, by weight, of a dry blend consisting essentially of 65-90 percent by weight of a glass frit consisting essentially of, expressed in weight percent on an oxide basis, 65-75 percent  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O}$ , 25-35 percent  $\text{SiO}_2$ , and optionally 1-5 percent  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ , and 10-35 percent by weight  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ , about 5 percent by weight of an organic binder, and 0 weight percent of a pore former, shaping the mixture to form a green body, and firing the green body in an electric furnace at a temperature of about 1550 °C over a period of about 12 hours, and held at a maximum temperature for about 4 hours (2 hours) in col. 1, line 58 to col. 6, line 28.

Morena does not disclose the mixture including 15-30 weight percent of a selected from the group consisting of deionized water, an emulsion consisting essentially of about 95 weight percent deionized water, about 0.7 weight percent triethanolamine, and about 4.3 weight percent oleic acid, and combinations thereof, or the polymer being selected from the group consisting of crosslinked polyacrylic acid copolymer, a polyethylene oxide polymer, and combinations thereof.

Nishimura et al. discloses a similar method wherein the mixture includes 70 weight percent (100 parts out of 142 parts total) of a dry blend and 19 weight percent of a solvent consisting of water, wherein the polymer is methylcellulose, and wherein the

Art Unit: 1724

mixture is shaped by extrusion into a honeycomb structure having an inlet end and an outlet end and a multiplicity of cells extending from the inlet end to the outlet end, the cells having porous walls and every other cell being plugged to form a wall-flow filter in col. 4, lines 27-63 and col. 9, line 65 to col. 10, line 14.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the solvent and methylcellulose polymer of Nishimura et al. into the mixture of Morena to produce a formable mixture capable of being extruded into a honeycomb filter.

While Nishimura et al. does not explicitly disclose the water being deionized water, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the need to use deionized water to avoid introducing foreign contaminants into the formable mixture.

With regard to claim 27, Morena discloses the polymer being added at about 5 percent by weight in col. 4, lines 57-61. The range of about 5 weight percent is seen as lying within the claimed range of 0.1-4 weight percent.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the proportion of the polymer in the mixture to provide a formable mixture having desired flow properties for a particular application.

With regard to claim 29, Morena discloses the glass frit optionally including a low proportion of alkaline earth metal oxides, such as strontium oxide (SrO), in col. 4, lines 11-20. Since the alkaline earth metals are limited to beryllium, magnesium, calcium,

strontium, barium, and radium, one of ordinary skill in the art would at once envisage the alkaline earth metal oxides including strontium oxide.

16. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morena and Nishimura et al. as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Mori et al.

Morena and Nishimura et al. do not disclose up to 2 percent by weight of  $\text{Li}_2\text{O}$  being substituted for  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O}$ .

Mori et al. discloses a similar mixture wherein 2 mole percent (0.2 weight percent) of  $\text{Li}_2\text{O}$  is substituted for  $\text{Cs}_2\text{O}$  in col. 3, lines 33-49.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the  $\text{Li}_2\text{O}$  of Mori et al. into the mixture of Morena and Nishimura et al. to maintain the low thermal expansion property of the ceramic within a range from room temperature to a temperature exceeding  $1000^\circ\text{C}$ , as suggested by Mori et al. in col. 3, lines 33-39.

17. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morena and Nishimura et al. as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Quadir et al.

Morena and Nishimura et al. do not disclose the polymer being a crosslinked polyacrylic acid copolymer.

Quadir et al. discloses a similar mixture wherein the polymer is a crosslinked polyacrylic acid copolymer in col. 2, lines 21-61.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the crosslinked polyacrylic acid copolymer for the methylcellulose polymer of Morena and Nishimura et al. in that such are alternate polymers in the art for producing a formable ceramic mixture, mere substitution of one known formable mixture producing polymer for another in the art being within the scope of one having ordinary skill in the art.

18. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morena and Nishimura et al. as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Bailey.

Nishimura et al. discloses the solvent being an emulsion consisting essentially of about 95 percent (93 weight percent) water and about 5 weight percent (7 weight percent) stearic acid, wherein the stearic acid serves as a lubricant in col. 10, lines 1-4.

Morena and Nishimura et al. do not disclose the solvent being an emulsion consisting essentially of about 95 weight percent deionized water, about 0.7 weight percent triethanolamine, and about 4.3 weight percent oleic acid.

Bailey discloses a ceramic mixture including an emulsion of water, triethanolamine, and oleic acid in col. 4, lines 16-19.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the triethanolamine and oleic acid lubricants of Bailey for the stearic acid lubricant of Morena and Nishimura et al. in that such are alternate lubricants in the art for producing a formable ceramic mixture, mere substitution of one



Art Unit: 1724

known lubricant for another in the art being within the scope of one having ordinary skill in the art.

While Bailey does not disclose the specific ratio of triethanolamine to oleic acid, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that the ratio could have been varied to provide a formable mixture having desired flow properties for a particular application.

19. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morena and Nishimura et al. as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Kasai et al.

Morena and Nishimura et al. do not disclose the pre former being graphite.

Kasai et al. discloses using graphite as a pore former in col. 5, lines 56-66.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the graphite pore formed of Kasai et al. for the pore former of Morena and Nishimura et al. in that such are alternate pore formers in the art for producing porous ceramics, mere substitution of one pore former for another in the art being within the scope of one having ordinary skill in the art.

### ***Conclusion***

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Locker reference discloses a similar method of forming a ceramic structure.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason M. Greene whose telephone number is (703) 308-6240. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday - Friday (7:00 AM to 5:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (703) 308-3318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Jason M. Greene  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1724



jmg  
April 15, 2003

DUANE SMITH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

